## Remarks

In the office action mailed 28 November 2007, the Examiner objected to the specification due to certain informalities, rejected claims 1-5, 7-11, and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Gorp (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0252319), and rejected claims 6 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Gorp in view of Kageyama (U.S. Patent Number 5,625,757).

Applicants have amended the specification in response to the Examiner's objection thereto. Applicants traverse the art based rejections and request reconsideration and withdrawal thereof. Applicants have amended all claims (1-14) for editorial clarity and to better protect the invention.

### *Objection to Specification*

The Examiner noted that reference number 20 should be 22 on page 2, line 17 and objected to the error. Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful reading and have made the suggested amendment.

### *§§102 and 103 Rejections*

The Examiner rejected all claims as either anticipated by Gorp or as unpatentable over Gorp in view of Kageyama. In particular, the Examiner rejected all independent claims (1, 7, 8, and 14) as anticipated by Gorp. As regards claim 1, the Examiner suggests that Gorp teaches the recited step (a) (querying the user regarding a portion of a document) at paragraphs 0044 and 0058-0060. Applicants respectfully disagree. Nowhere does Gorp teach that a user is queried regarding a portion of a document. Gorp speaks in all the cited paragraphs and throughout the document to automatically detecting an error in merging or collating the printed output of multiple print streams. As noted throughout Gorp, each page has machine readable identifier (22a-c of FIG. 3 - see, e.g., paragraphs 0038-0041). In association with a merging device (e.g., 18 of FIG. 2), some scanning device (26a-c of FIG. 2) monitors these machine readable identifiers to confirm proper sequencing of the final output being merged from multiple printers each processing a different print data stream (see, e.g., paragraphs 0011, 0042, 0043, 0059, and 0062). In all cases, the systems and methods of Gorp attempt automated recovery of such a collating error identified by the scanning devices. Gorp suggests an error may be signaled to an

operator but does not suggest that the system operates to reprint a portion of a previously printed document directed by a user's response to a query regarding the portion. Gorp merely signals a user that some error has occurred that it cannot automatically repair.

Further, Gorp is not addressing the merging of a newly reprinted portion with a remaining portion of a previously printed document and thus fails to teach step (b) of claim 1 - instructing a user how to load the remaining portion in the insertion tray associated with the printer.

More generally, Gorp is not teaching a method or system for reprinting an identified portion of a previously printed document and automatically merging it with a remaining portion of that previously printed document. Such a system and method, as discussed in the summary of the subject application, allows for reprinting a portion of a previously printed document that needs to be reprinted for any reason. For example, where a particular page or range of pages in a previously printed document needs to be replaced with updated information, the remaining portion of the document need not be reprinted - only the page or pages containing the erroneous information. Gorp provides for no such mechanism. The inputs to Gorp's merging or collating device are the outputs of multiple printers (and auxiliary devices such as for inserted credit cards etc.) each processing a print data stream to print, anew, a corresponding portion of the final collated/merged document. There is no capability (structure or method steps) in Gorp to combine or merge a remaining portion of a previously printed document with a portion containing an erroneous page that is reprinted.

The Examiner cites similar teachings of Gorp as showing the remaining steps of rejected claim 1 (steps (c) and (d)). But these citations of Gorp similarly fail to teach the basic claimed method or structure wherein a portion of a previously printed document is reprinted and then automatically merged with a remaining portion of the previously printed document. Rather, as noted above, Gorp teaches only methods and structures for merging multiple newly printed data streams - each processed anew by a corresponding printer to print a portion of the ultimate, merged/collated, final document.

In view of the above discussion, Applicants maintain that claim 1 is allowable over Gorp and over all art of record considered individually or in any combination. Independent claims 7, 8,

and 14 were rejected as anticipated by Gorp for similar reasons and thus are maintained to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Dependent claims 2-6 and 9-13 recite still further limitations but were rejected either as anticipated by Gorp or as unpatentable over Gorp in view of Kageyama. Applicants maintain that dependent claims 2-6 and 9-13 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 8, respectively, and as dependent from allowable base claims. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of all claims under §§102 or 103.

***Conclusion***

Applicants have amended the specification in response to the Examiner's objection thereto, have traversed and thoroughly discussed the Examiner's rejections of all claims, and have requested reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections. Applicants have amended claims 1-14 for editorial clarity and to better protect the invention.

Applicants believe no fees are due in this matter. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss the matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **28 February 2008**

**/Daniel N. Fishman/**

**SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER**

Daniel N. Fishman, Reg. No. 35,512
Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
Telephone: (303) 786-7687
Facsimile: (303) 786-7691